

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/036,067	MADOCKS, JOHN E.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Rudy Zervigon	1763

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Rudy Zervigon.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 10 November 2005

**Time:** 13:00

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*All pending*

Claims discussed:

*All pending*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: I called the law offices of Regelman, PC to inquire on the disposition of the case both on the 10th and the 14th. No one returned my phone call from the 10th. I again called on the 14th and an attorney spoke for Mr. Madocks who said the case was moved to another attorney (Robert von Hollens - 602.956.7000). The Examiner attempted to reach this attorney on the 14th, yet no phone call was returned..